From: aaron@urbanplaceconsulting.com

Subject: RE: Fig BID renewal

Date: January 23, 2017 at 5:39 PM



That parcel is assessed at \$26K/year.

It's a large campus parcel covering part of Vermont and Jefferson.

As mentioned, it's been in the BID at that level for some time, but just didn't make those totals we shared.

I'll let you if I need any assistance with Dee. She's been great to work with in the past.

Thanks, Aaron

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: Fig BID renewal

From:

Date: Mon, January 23, 2017 4:55 pm

To: "aaron@urbanplaceconsulting.com" <aaron@urbanplaceconsulting.com>

Aaron - I understand. Is the difference real large? I can check in with Dee if needed.

**Executive Director** 

USC Local Government Relations

From: <u>aaron@urbanplaceconsulting.com</u> < <u>aaron@urbanplaceconsulting.com</u> >

Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 2:39 PM

Subject: Fig BID renewal

Hi David,

We've officially been given the okay by the City to start sending out petitions to renew

Petition packets should go out in the mail by the end of this week and we'll also be sending electronic packets to the board. As with past renewals, the USC petition package will be mailed to the Real Estate Department, care of Dee Jackson. Dee is familiar with the BID and renewal process and helps facilitate getting the petition to the right person to sign/return.

On the USC petition(attached), I wanted to give you a heads up that the total amount is higher from the numbers we last passed along to you. The reason for this is that we discovered an additional parcel that is owned by USC and was mismarked in our renewal database as being owned by someone else. I just caught this after double checking ownership/mailing addresses through County data.

This parcel and its assessment were not in totals we shared with you in July and

snould nave been since it's been in the Fig בוט since the beginning and owned/paid by USC during that time.

Any questions on this, please let me know.

Thanks, Aaron